Book Reviews

Johnson, Paul. *The Quest For God: A Personal Pilgrimage.* New York: Harper/Collins, 1996. 208 pp. ISBN 0-06-017344-0

Paul Johnson, the noted British historian and journalist, author of such popular works as *Modern Times* and *A History of the Jews,* has most recently undertaken the broad project of *The Quest for God.* No doubt drawing from his journalistic experience, Johnson hooks the reader, remarkably so, in his early chapters as he discourses on the theme "the God who would not die" as well as on the probing question, "Is there an alternative to God?" Dispelling some of the triumphalism of the modern project—which had little place for God—Johnson correctly notes that science, unlike its reception in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, "has [now] lost its power to shake faith." But perhaps the principal reason for the survival of belief in the deity as we approach the twenty-first century is, as Johnson puts it, "the abject, failure of the alternatives to God." Indeed, the more we learn about the principal pundits of atheism during our century such as Bertrand Russell, A.J. Ayer, and Jean Paul Sartre—especially the latter in terms of his gross mistreatment of women—the less attractive both they and their philosophies become—especially when considered against the backdrop of such godly people as Thomas Merton, Therese of Lisieux, and Mother Theresa.

Though the reader may revel in the iconoclastic tendency of Johnson as he takes on the totalitarian alternatives to God such as Fascism and Communism, few liberals (political or theological) will be happy with the boldness and sheer intellectual courage of this author as he repudiates the project of liberation theology in his observation that it is "plainly and simply an anti-Christian heresy, without any moral basis," as he lays the blame for the spread of AIDS principally on the back of the homosexual community and its "reckless promiscuity" (and the data supports this judgment), and as he perceptively points out that "race politics, like sexual politics, constitutes an alternative religion for some."

Unfortunately, however, the intellectual tour de force of the initial chapters is not maintained throughout the book. For example, when Johnson raises the question "What [rather than who] is God, then?" in the fourth chapter, one expects an invitation to a journey, a genuine and serious exploration of the possibilities and richness of God. What one encounters, on the other hand,—and this utterly takes the reader by surprise in light of the title *The Quest for God*—is Johnson's deadpan observation that "My personal image of God has not changed much since I was a child, and I suspect this is true of most people." The quest, in other words, is over before it has begun. Moreover, after pointing out that the Roman Catholic Church is "indeed an autocracy

and the pope is an autocrat," the author then draws an analogy between the British army and this church, and observes: "The army commands, and I obey. When so ordered, I go over the top and take part in the attack." This may or may not be noble, but, again, is it a quest? I, for one, think not. Indeed, the remainder of the work which explores the issues of theodicy, the uniqueness of humanity, the possibility of life on other planets, the relation between Christians and Jews, death, and the afterlife, is so unoriginal, so narrow in its reflections, and at times even dogmatic, as to be downright tedious.

Beyond this, and perhaps more importantly, the argumentation of these later chapters is based not on Scripture or on critical reasoning, but on a simple and broad appeal to Roman Catholic dogma. To illustrate, though Johnson does forego a consideration of the mechanics of indulgences, because "I know nothing is more calculated to irritate and even disgust those not brought up Catholic," he nevertheless develops several themes which are sure to offend not only Protestants but a larger audience as well. Thus, not only does he apparently sweep aside some of the evil of the medieval church in his glib observation concerning the construction of the great European cathedrals that "if it was part of God's plan that they would have been constructed, in part, with the coinage of ecclesiastical corruption, who are we to object," not only does he justify praying to Mary and the saints by means of the specious argument that "a great many people, more pious and wiser than I am, have thought it worth their while to pray in this manner," not only does he pray, oddly enough, to Jane Austen in literary matters and Dr. Johnson for who knows what, but he then goes on to point out—in a way which is sure to roil many of his readers, both Catholic and Protestant alike, that "God is not interested in historical facts in this instance, but rather the image of holiness which has been created in the minds of the faithful by long tradition..." Oh, really?

The Quest for God, then, if it is anything, is not proof either for the likeliness or the plausibility of the existence of God; instead, it is proof that though a gifted writer may have many literary honors to his credit, such honors do not assure the success of any present project.

KENNETH J. COLLINS
Asbury Theological Seminary
Wilmore, Kentucky

Steele, Richard B. *"Gracious Affection" and "True Virtue" According to Jonathan Edwards and John Wesley*. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1994. 425 pages. $57.50.

The religious awakenings of the eighteenth century were in many ways a single, transatlantic revival, in which the various movements and personalities mutually influenced one another. In light of this, there has been a need for a thorough examination of the relationship between the two theological giants of the awakenings, Jonathan Edwards and John Wesley. This Richard Steele has provided us in his carefully researched and clearly written book.

Steele argues persuasively that Edwards' Calvinism and Wesley's Arminianism distract us

from significant areas of agreement which have contemporary import. His thesis is that for both Edwards and Wesley,

> "saving faith" or "the experimental knowledge of God" necessarily entails three heuristically distinguishable but existentially inseparable components: the avowal of Christian doctrine, the cultivation of "true virtue," and the experience of "gracious affections." (xi)

This they held in marked contrast to "intellectualist" explanations of the relation between reason and emotion, in which reason as the higher human faculty should govern the will rather than emotion. Edwards and Wesley offer a "voluntarist" alternative which rejects the reason/emotion conflict in favor of a holistic anthropology, in which the faculties of reason, emotion, and will interpenetrate and cooperate. Salvation does not mean the dominance of one privileged faculty over another but the subordination of the whole person to a transcendent good. (61-62)

The positions developed by Edwards and Wesley is of more than historical interest to Steele. While not the focus of this book, he believes their perspective "deserves to be restored to a place of honor in contemporary religious studies," having the potential to overcome the gulf between rationalist virtue ethicists who ignore emotions and social scientists who describe religious experience of persons without reference to their normative beliefs. (x) This allies Steele with contemporary proponents of recovering the language of affections or emotions such as Don E. Saliers and Robert C. Roberts.

Steele lays the groundwork for his comparison by devoting two chapters to context. In the first, Steele helpfully places Edwards and Wesley within social, ecclesiological, theological, and philosophical contexts. The Enlightenment led to an abandonment of the holistic anthropology of the Reformation and the development of rival moral psychologies, each championing one of the three faculties over the other. Edwards and Wesley sought to creatively reappropriate that earlier holistic tradition in their "experimental theologies." In the second chapter Steele offers a brief historical sketch of this tradition, from the New Testament through Augustine, Calvin, and the Puritans.

After a review of secondary literature, Steele begins his comparison of the two theologians. His analysis covers four areas: biographical parallels, historical connections, abridgements of Edwards by Wesley, and parallel writings. While the biographic and historical material is not new, Steele's way of marshaling this information is. Among other things, he provides the first comprehensive narrative of the historical connections between Edwards and Wesley, which are indirect yet mutually influential.

More important, however, are his chapters on the abridgements and parallel writings. Here Steele makes his strongest case for fundamental similarities between Edwards and Wesley, concluding that Wesley no less than Edwards is essentially a theologian within the Reformed tradition. Indeed, Steele suspects "that some contemporary Wesleyans may find it a bit unsettling to learn just how deeply indebted their founder's thought was to that of the great New England Puritan..." (242)

Steele's analysis of Wesley's abridgements of five of Edwards' writings invites comparisons with Gregory S. Clapper's *John Wesley on Religious Affections*, published in 1989 by Scarecrow

Press. While Steele draws upon Clapper and they are motivated by a common concern for the recovery of the affections, the two books are essentially different. Clapper does examine Wesley's abridgement of Edwards' *Treatise on Religious Affections*, but his focus is on Wesley's understanding of the affections, especially in the *Notes on the New Testament*. Steele adds further to our understanding of Wesley, in this regard making his book complementary to Clapper's work.

Some of Steele's best analysis is in his comparison of parallel writings. In order to argue the recognized differences between Edwards and Wesley "must be seen as a family feud *within* the Reformed tradition," Steele seeks to show their "proximity to each other" by gauging "their distances from common enemies." (270-271) He proceeds to compare their responses to three such enemies: John Taylor on original sin, Lord Kames on the will, and Francis Hutcheson on the "moral sense." He concludes that, for all their differences, Edwards and Wesley are in the same theological family.

Steele's discussion is carefully nuanced—he does not make this claim without at the same time acknowledging the important differences. But even on free will, Steele argues for theological proximity, showing that "Edwards' denial of free will was not a denial of human liberty; nor was Wesley's assertion of free will ever meant to legitimate complete autonomy from God." (341) Wesley, Steele concludes, actually had a stronger view of human depravity than Edwards.

Although I am not the least dismayed by Wesley's indebtedness to Edwards, especially concerning the affections, I question the conclusion that Wesley is part of the Reformed tradition. Certainly Wesley is a Protestant, and like Edwards seeks to be faithful to major emphases held in common by the Reformers. These include the priority of grace, its necessity for salvation, and the total corruption of the *imago Dei*.

However, the Reformed tradition as I understand it is characterized by a strong emphasis on the sovereignty of God and irresistible grace. Wesley, drawing on both non-Reformed and non-Protestant sources, argued instead that God's chief characteristic is love and understood grace as universally enabling a free response to God. Moreover, the goal of salvation for Wesley is Christian perfection, the restoration of the *imago Dei* in this life. It was the integration of Christian perfection with more typically Protestant emphases such as original sin, and the corresponding view of grace which makes this possible, that distinguishes the Wesleyan tradition from the Reformed.

This one problematic aspect of Steele's conclusion in no way diminishes the importance and value of his work. He has shown convincingly that Edwards and Wesley shared theological convictions which were at the heart of their respective theologies and foundational to the eighteenth-century awakenings. He amply demonstrates his thesis that theirs was a holistic and integrated anthropology in which beliefs, affections, and the practice of virtue were inextricably linked. Steele's clearly written account will be invaluable not only for understanding their theologies but for constructive theological work today.

HENRY H. KNIGHT III
Assistant Professor of Evangelism
Saint Paul School of Theology
Kansas City, Missouri

Steele, Richard B. *"Gracious Affection" and "True Virtue" According to Jonathan Edwards and John Wesley.* Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow press, 1994. 425 pp. $57.50.

This book is a moderately revised publication of Steele's doctoral dissertation, which was completed in 1990 at Marquette University. It is published as the fifth monograph in the Pietist and Wesleyan Studies series at Scarecrow Press. Its publication will be welcomed not only by Edwards and Wesley scholars, but also by those interested in issues of moral psychology and virtue ethics.

Steele's basic agenda in this study is to show that both Edwards and Wesley stand in what he calls the "voluntarist" tradition of Western Christian moral psychology, and that their respective "experimental theologies" can only be understood in this light. By "voluntarism" in moral psychology, Steele refers to an account of human decision and action that gives positive value to some nonrational factors (such as emotions or affections) in motivation. He contrasts this tradition with "intellectualism," which assumes that the will is a "rational appetite" that follows the last dictate of the intellect, and that obtains freedom only by subjugating the passions. Steele notes that intellectualism has been the dominant position in Western Christian theology, and stresses that it was the reigning position leading into the Eighteenth Century in particular. In this light, he takes it as a striking similarity that both Edwards and Wesley would gravitate instead to voluntarist positions, sharing the conviction that genuine religion necessarily interweaves volitional, affectional, and cognitive elements. He tries to account for this similarity through reflections on both commonalities in their individual religious pilgrimages and mutual influence from some prior representatives of the voluntarist tradition (he treats Paul, Augustine, Calvin, and Ames).

On first consideration, Steele's thesis is likely to sound quite foreign to Reformed and Methodist ears. This is because nineteenth-century theological forces in both camps decisively rejected any "affectional" moral psychology, opting for a resurgent intellectualism as the apparent requirement to preserve human freedom. Before long these later scholars were reading their intellectualist views back into Edwards and Wesley. By convincingly demonstrating that such an intellectualist reading does not fit, Steele allows his subjects to speak again in their own voice. Within the field of Wesley Studies in particular, his original dissertation (along with related work by Gregory Clapper) has already fostered some important revisions in accounts of Wesley's theological anthropology and moral psychology.

This impact of Steele's work should suggest the value of the present book for Wesley scholars. Another strength that scholars will find in this book is its model of methodology. Steele takes seriously the theological significance of Wesley's editorial work. He devotes an entire chapter (pp. 182-267) to analyzing Wesley's edited versions of five treatises by Edwards. His careful analysis is a model for future studies of other areas of Wesley's editorial work.

Precisely because his main thesis has already attracted some attention in Wesley Studies, it might be most to complete this review by noting two areas where Steele's reading is most open to question or revision. To begin with, Steele notes repeatedly that one of his agendas is to show that Edwards's Puritan Calvinism and Wesley's

Evangelical Arminianism are less antithetical than their respective disciples have often assumed. In particular, he argues that they were in substantial agreement that humans need a healing for original sin that comes only through the Holy Spirit imparting regenerating grace. As such, he suggests that the difference between Edwards and Wesley is a family feud within the Reformed tradition (p. 270). But this claim appears to miss a significant difference between Edwards and Wesley on *how* the Holy Spirit works in regenerating fallen humanity. In his *Treatise Concerning Religious Affections* Edwards treats holy affections as an "infused *habitus*," or a gift unilaterally from God that then necessarily represses evil affections and effects holy acts (e.g., Part III, §7). Wesley consistently edited out such suggestions, because he sensed that they undercut the cooperant nature of grace. More to the point, I would argue that Wesley did not see regenerating grace as a "created" reality that could be infused in any case. Grace is instead the very renewed Presence of the Holy Spirit in our lives, cooperantly renewing us. But this is to locate Wesley's fundamental loyalties more in the view of Christian renewal of the early Greek theologians than the Reformed tradition!

The second area where Steele's reading of Wesley is open to some question is on the very topic of moral psychology (esp. pp. 298-311). Steele makes it obvious that he prefers Edwards's account of moral psychology to that of Wesley (which he characterizes as grossly incoherent). The point at issue here is not just Edwards's identification of will with the affections, but his "compatibilist" account of human freedom as simply the freedom to "do what you will." Steele is very aware that later Methodist debates countered Edwards's compatibilism with an intellectualist indeterminism of the will; and given these two options, he prefers Edwards. But are there only two options? While Steele suggests that Wesley is incoherently moving in the direction of later Methodism, Wesley actually agreed quite consistently with Edwards's identification of the will and the affection. The difference is that Wesley then joined John Locke in stressing that humans retains some "liberty" either to enact or not to enact their "will." That is, Wesley located freedom not in the indeterminate will, but in the person as a whole. I believe that this is a viable third option, and expect it will receive serious consideration in future studies of Wesley's moral psychology. But the very fact that this topic will be on the agenda is a debt owed to Richard Steele, and his fine first contribution to Wesley Studies!

RANDY L. MADDOX
Sioux Falls College
Sioux Falls, South Dakota

Buller, Cornelius A. *The Unity of Nature and History in Pannenberg's Theology*. Lanham, Md.: Littlefield Adams Books, 1996. 227 pp.

Since the appearance of *Offenbarung als Geschichte*, Wolfhart Pannenberg has produced a steady stream of thoughtful and provocative writings on a wide range of the-

ological issues. His thorough analyses, insightful proposals, and creative speculations have delighted a generation of fans and exasperated a generation of critics. With the completion of his magnum opus, his three volume *Systematic Theology*, in 1993 (English translation of first two volumes by the summer of 1994), one expects there will be forthcoming a number of studies on various aspects of Pannenberg's thought. One hopes they will be as well done as Cornelius Buller's *The Unity of Nature and History in Pannenberg's Theology*.

Buller's primary enterprise in this text is the examination of what he calls "the particular modern problematique of ecology" (21) in the light of the theological perspective presented in Pannenberg's theology. His central thesis is that Pannenberg's understanding of the unity of nature and history, two categories generally put into opposition in modern thought, provides a foundation for a more adequate understanding of how humans are to exercise dominion over creation. Buller's examination is carried out in three discernible stages: 1) an introduction to the problem, 2) a review of particularly relevant aspects of Pannenberg's thought using the rubrics of "God the Creator" and "God the Redeemer," and 3) a discussion which attempts to apply these insights to his particular concern.

In the introduction, Buller tells us that a major part of the ecological problematique is a modern dualism which sets humanity and nature at odds. He quotes, as typical of the attitude underlying this dualism, Bacon's statement that "[w]e will press nature to the rack until she divulges her secrets." (7) Buller goes on to write that this "statement suggests that the practice of science sets in radical opposition the aims of human activity and the good of the non-human universe." (7) The solution to the problem of modern dualism, says Buller, is a reconceptualization of God, the world, and their inter-relationship. It is here that Pannenberg's thought helps, writes Buller, for it represents a "thoroughgoing attempt to think of humans and the nonhuman world as together taken up into a divinely grounded unity that includes all histories, whether they be human, organic, geological, or stellar." (21)

In the second movement, Buller explores the implications of Pannenberg's doctrines of creation and redemption. He shows how the former aptly presents a strong view of the positive relation between the Creator and the creation without blurring the distinction between the two. As Buller concludes, "only if the Creator is one is it possible to think of creation as a united and uniting process." (80) The one God is Creator of one creation. Buller then moves to the doctrine of redemption to show how closely Pannenberg construes the relations between God and the world. God not only creates one world, but his love for his creation leads him to undertake its redemption. Further, this redemption extends "to include all reality." (136) It is ultimately for humans to mediate "God's love in the world" so that "capricious manipulation and consumption of the non-human world" is precluded. (136)

In the final part of the discussion, Buller attempts to take the insights he has gained from the preceding discussions in order to show more precisely how they provide relief from "modern dualism." He recognizes that Pannenberg's work does not contain an extended consideration of ecological issues, but he presents a reasonable extrapolation. Near the end of this work, Buller draws the following conclusion: "The rule of

humans over creation is to have the character of a servant priesthood and kingship, both of which are defined through the character of Jesus' self-giving love." (194)

There are a number of points one could make by way of critical assessment of Buller's work; I will limit myself to three. First, Pannenberg's work has been called "brilliant but difficult," and even a quick survey of the critical literature shows that merely "getting it right" is praiseworthy. It seems to me that Buller has done an admirable job of understanding Pannenberg's thought, and he has likewise done a fine job of presenting it in a fashion that can be grasped by beginning theological students. Yet, he avoids the serious loss of content that often accompanies such presentation.

Second, the great difficulty one faces in making a concise presentation of a body of work as diverse as Pannenberg's is correctly deciding what material must be presented and what can be safely omitted. While Buller generally does quite well, there are a couple of areas where additional discussion would have helped. One would have been an earlier and slightly more detailed presentation of Dilthey's influence. Pannenberg has said that Dilthey is the philosopher who has most influenced him, and there are aspects of Pannenberg's thought which become much clearer once one sees how he appropriates Dilthey. Likewise, given that Pannenberg seeks to establish the notion of "the Infinite" as the primary category in the doctrine of God, a brief discussion of the relation between immanence and transcendence which follows from Pannenberg's appropriation of Hegel would have been helpful.

Finally, Buller provides an excellent entree into Pannenberg's thought, and consequently, this work is more likely to be of interest to the student who is marginally (or less) familiar with Pannenberg's work. While Buller gives response to a few criticisms which appear in the secondary literature, this work provides relatively little by way of critical assessment of Pannenberg's various proposals.

CHARLES E. GUTENSON
Wilmore, Kentucky

Noll, Mark. *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind: Are Any Evangelicals Blameless?*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.

"The scandal of the evangelical mind is that there is not much of an evangelical mind" (p. 3). So writes Wheaton College history professor Mark Noll in an impassioned, provocative, and insightful new book from Eerdmans (1994) that, because of its multiple targets, is bound to trigger extensive debate. For Wesleyans *The Scandal's* fleeting but disparaging treatment of the holiness movement proves doubly disturbing—both when it hits the mark and when it is wide of the mark.

Dr. Noll makes a strong case for the woeful neglect of the mind by American evangelicals: "To put it most simply, the evangelical ethos is activistic, populist, pragmatic, and utilitarian. It allows little space for broader or deeper intellectual effort because it is dominated by the urgencies of the moment" (p. 12). While North American evangeli-

calism deserves credit for "great sacrifice in spreading the message of salvation in Jesus Christ, open-hearted generosity to the needy, heroic personal exertion on behalf of troubled individuals, and the unheralded sustenance of countless church and parachurch communities," it has not produced "a single research university or a single periodical devoted to in-depth interaction with modern culture" (p. 3). Dr. Noll approvingly quotes U.N. diplomat and Eastern Orthodox Christian, Charles Malik, who, at the dedication of Wheaton College's Billy Graham Center in 1980, warned, "The problem is not only to win souls but to save minds. If you win the whole world and lose the mind of the world, you will soon discover you have not won the world" (p. 26).

Yet as much as Dr. Noll yearns for a greater evangelical intellectual contribution, he also recognizes the possibility of the opposite scandal of intellectual pride, which he rightly calls another "snare to faith" (p. 31). I Corinthians offers appropriate cautions regarding the wisdom of this world. Nevertheless, this scripture too often has been misused to equate godliness with ignorance. Here, Dr. Noll counters by quoting John Calvin to good effect: In Corinthians, "being fools" does not mean that "those who are gifted with quickness of mind [are] to become dull, as if a man cannot be a Christian unless he is more like a beast than a man. The profession of Christianity requires us to be immature, not in our thinking, but in malice" (p. 38).

If Dr. Noll is right, as I believe he is, that "American evangelicals have failed notably in sustaining serious intellectual life" (p. 3), how so? He would say the answers lie:

1. In eighteenth-century separation of church and state that fostered a competitive mentality prizing immediate results (new adherents) above all else;
2. In nineteenth-century revivalism that was "pragmatic, populist, charismatic, and technological more than intellectual" (p. 55);
3. In twentieth-century fundamentalism which "also undercut the hereditary Protestant conviction that it was a good thing to love the Lord with our minds" (p. 60); and
4. In a division of labor between Christian undergraduate and seminary education which has short-circuited "cross-fertilization between theological reflection and reflection in the arts and sciences" (p. 20).

Above all, the culprit Dr. Noll can least abide is twentieth-century Protestant anti-intellectualism in the form of fundamentalism. This mental dead end, we are told, has been aided and abetted by three equally deplorable theological next of kin: dispensationalism, the holiness movement, and pentecostalism. Time and time again all three members of this odd troika are specifically blamed for a twentieth-century "disaster" and ongoing "damage to evangelical thought" (pp. 24 and 249; see also 110, 115, 133, 138, 142, 227, and 249). I say odd because it is a theological strain to place holiness folk and pentecostals in the same camp, or to place both in the same camp with dispensationalists, who believe that the Bible "divides the relationship of God to humanity into sharply separated epochs" (p. 119), and who discount healing miracles and tongues speaking as spiritual manifestations of a previous dispensation. Also, the proposition that the holiness movement and pentecostalism even belong under the heading of fundamentalism is open to serious debate.

The fact is, lumping disparate dispensationalist, holiness adherents, and pentecostals

together is exceedingly peculiar—except from the perspective of a Grand Rapids-Wheaton reformed theological axis. Wesleyan and holiness faithful find it just as discomforting being grouped with dispensationalists and pentecostals as post-1940s Grand Rapids-Wheaton reformed folk would find it discomforting being grouped with fundamentalists and dispensationalists. But from a Wesleyan perspective all it takes to be a Calvinist is to believe salvation cannot be sinned away. And by that definition reformed, fundamentalists, dispensationalists, and most Baptists share the same quarters. A lot depends on one's perspective. For example, from an Eastern Orthodox point of view not only all Protestants, but Catholics as well, appear pretty much alike: what appear to Western Christians as myriad differences pale before what Orthodox see as shared Protestant and Catholic tendencies to view faith as rationally comprehensible and lacking in awe and mystery.

Concerning Dr. Noll's critique that the holiness movement did not emulate the rich and deep intellectual legacy of its mentor, John Wesley, I have little argument, though that sad fact, fortunately, is less true today than it was even two decades ago. What is arguable is the false impression left by *The Scandal* that holiness teaching fostered a general pacifity before, and withdrawal from, a hostile world (pp. 123, 142, 144). Without doubt Dr. Noll knows that the holiness movement was at the cutting edge of nineteenth-century social reform: he even cites Timothy Smith's landmark study of this phenomenon, *Revivalism and Social Reform*. Along with the rest of Evangelicalism the holiness movement did retreat to some extent from social reform in the early twentieth century. But even this century witnessed the forward march of the Salvation Army and a holiness home and foreign missions dynamic that must qualify Dr. Noll's harsh judgment of withdrawal.

Few would deny holiness anti-intellectual strains—I myself have heard too many camp-meeting sermons against book learning to object. Still, from a Wesleyan perspective, in this century, the greatest damage to evangelical intellectual inquiry *quantitatively* has been Calvinist—whether emanating from fundamentalist, dispensationalist, Baptist, or baptistic churches. Furthermore, since many reformed folk cannot quite conceive of evangelicalism outside the framework of Calvinist definitions and theological categories, their intolerance and misreading of other perspectives—even to the point of equating *Wesleyan* with *liberal*—deserve the label anti-intellectual.

What is not made clear in *The Scandal of the Evangelical Mind* is that the intellectual damage in question has been inflicted by the whole evangelical community, not just those elements outside the northern, reformed, post-fundamentalist orbit. Take three examples. First, the book most responsible for what Dr. Noll believes to be ill-considered, Adventist-inspired, young earth creationism, John Whitcomb's and Henry Morris's *The Genesis Flood: The Biblical Record and Its Scientific Implications* (1961), was published by Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, with its informal, filial ties with Westminster Seminary (pp. 190-91, 202).

Two, Dr. Noll regrets the continuing evangelical tendency to read each Middle East crisis "as a direct fulfillment of biblical prophecy heralding the end of the world" (p. 13), most recently in two evangelical best sellers that benefitted handsomely from the Gulf War: John Walvoord's 1990 revision of his *Armageddon, Oil, and the Middle East*

Crisis, and Charles Dyer's 1991 *Rise of Babylon: Sign of the End Times.* Yet while dispensational in content, we have the Grand Rapids-Wheaton evangelical "mainstream" to thank for their publication, Zondervan (Grand Rapids, MI) and Tyndale (Carol Stream, IL), respectively.

Third, because of a powerful Wheaton College trustee who opposed faculty "time off," holiness Asbury College, with a fraction of Wheaton's resources, managed to launch a formal sabbatical program first. The point is, no part of the evangelical community has been immune to tangents and spasms of anti-intellectualism.

Wesleyans presently must live not only with the scandal of the evangelical mind, but with the scandal of Calvinist domination of the history of American protestantism and evangelical thought. This Babylonian captivity is not the fault of reformed scholars; rather, it is the default of too many activist Wesleyans who have neglected the Pauline injunction to "study to show thyself approved." It is to be expected that Calvinists, even so gentlemanly and gracious a representative as Mark Noll is in person, will reflect reformed perspectives to the detriment of a Wesleyan worldview. The only possible correctives are 1) for Wesleyans to study more, to think more, and to write more—and to study, think, and write about more than theology and church life; and 2) for Calvinists to cease and desist from using *reformed* and *Evangelical* as synonyms.

MARK ELLIOTT
Institute for East-West Christian Studies
Billy Graham Center
Wheaton College
Wheaton, Illinois

Bible Works for Windows by *Hermeneutika* (CD Rom edition $395 list price)

At the beginning of the 1980s, when I started becoming computer literate, there were few affordable resources to help the pastor or teacher or educated layperson explore and study the Bible, much less study it in its original languages. I remember well learning to use extra-memory resident programs like Scripture Fonts and learning how to integrate that material in a DOS format. It was often a slow and painful process with difficulties at every turn (e.g., how in the world to eliminate the extra space created by word wrap in Hebrew lines that were created from right to left). Thankfully those days are long gone and now there are a plethora of resources available, even if one is talking about programs that provide you with the Bible in its original languages.

Among the more sophisticated programs created for IBM compatible computers (the program and fonts are also available for MAC users) which are nonetheless user friendly for the lay person as well as for the clergy and scholars, far and away the best I have found is *Bible Works for Windows.* Just the basic features of this resource make it indispensable—in addition to the usual complement of modern English translations

(including NRSV, NIV, NKJV, and others) and a host of foreign translations (Spanish, German, French, Finnish) this one CD includes all the 27th edition of the Nestle-Aland Greek NT, the BHS Hebrew OT (corrected 1990 edition), the LXX (Ralphs edition), and both Greek and Hebrew Lexicons and aides. In addition there are Greek and Hebrew concordances, English Concordances (Strong's), A Bible Dictionary, and I could go on.

What makes this particular program most worthwhile is not just the resources it provides but its basic features. For example, its tag code system allows searches of whatever form of a verb or noun one might wish to find parallel examples of. It is also possible to have multiple translations on the screen at once in four parallel columns, or one can have the original language text (both Hebrew and Greek simultaneously) two translations and then lexical helps for each column at the bottom of the screen. In short, this tool can save a person countless hours of reading through lexicons, versions of the Bible, concordances and the like. The program can do your searches for you, and the results are easily pasted into one's favorite word processing program (e.g. I use WordPerfect 6.1). The program is equally easy to use if you prefer to operate only in English or if you choose to use the original languages, and as a resource for preparing lectures, Sunday School lessons, and sermons it is without equal. There are of course other similar programs (e.g. Logos 2.0) but none that I know of have the power, speed, and user friendliness of this program, not even Note Bene. My advice to all those in a quandary about what Bible program to buy is this--if you have any desire to get at the original meaning of God's Word for whatever purposes, this should be your basic tool. You get the works with *Bibleworks for Windows.*

BEN WITHERINGTON, III
Asbury Theological Seminary
Wilmore, Kentucky

Voigt, Karl Heinz. *Die Heiligungsbewegung zwischen Methodistischer Kirche und Landeskirchlicher Gemeinschaft: Die "Triumphreise" von Robert Pearsall Smith im Jahre 1875 und ihre Auswirkungen auf die zwischenkirchlicher Beziehungen*: (Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus Verlag, 1996), 214 pp.

Voigt, a continental United Methodist historian and former West Berlin District Superintendent, has through meticulous research filled a longstanding void in Wesleyan historical studies. He examines the brief yet explosive impact of the American-based Wesleyan-holiness movement upon continental Protestantism, with special attention given to the "triumphal" preaching trip of Robert Pearsal Smith, the American holiness evangelist, through Germany and Switzerland in 1875. Although Smith's wife, Hannah Whitall Smith, is better known due to her holiness classic, *The Christian's Secret of a Happy Life,* his short-lived yet meteoric career as a holiness evangelist propelled him into recognition among the highest German church and political officials of his day.

Using extensive archival research, Voigt examines the massive assemblies that gathered to hear Smith, as well as his encounters with leading German theologians, such as Jellinghaus, and even with the Kaiser Wilhelm I. However, Voigt's most distinctive contribution is found in his treatment of the effects of Smith's itinerary upon the ongoing relations between the ensuing holiness movement within the Protestant state churches (*die Gemeinschaftsbewegung*) and the free church holiness bodies, the Episcopal Methodists and the Evangelical Association. Previous studies have focused almost exclusively upon the state church developments. This clearly written and well documented work should deepen the ongoing dialog between the state churches and free churches in present-day Germany. It also extends our knowledge of the international scope of the American-based Wesleyan-holiness revival, that peaked in the late 1800s. As such, it offers a helpful complement to and extends into the international arena the work begun in Melvin Dieter's pathbreaking survey of the movement.

J. STEVEN O'MALLEY
Asbury Theological Seminary
Wilmore, Kentucky